



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,607	10/23/2001	Lino Tavares	208.1004US	1029
7590	11/14/2008		EXAMINER	
Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC 14th Floor 485 Seventh Avenue New York, NY 10018				GHALI, ISIS A D
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1611		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		11/14/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/045,607	TAVARES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Isis A. Ghali	1611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 0731.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 8-11,13,14,16,20,22-24,29,30,32-38 and 40-55 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 8-11,13,14,16,20,22-24,29,30,32-38 and 40-55 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/31/2008.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The receipt is acknowledged of applicants' amendment and IDS, both filed 07/31/2008.

Claims 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 22-24, 29, 30, 32-38, and 40-49 previously prosecuted.

Claims 50-55 have been added.

Claims 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 22-24, 29, 30, 32-38, and 40-55 are currently pending and included in the prosecution.

The following new ground of rejection is necessitated by applicants' amendment:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims introduced new matter as they recite "the delivery system comprises a solution of the loratadine or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt thereof". Recourse to the specification, no disclosure of solution of loratadine to form a transdermal delivery device. Paragraph 0099 of the present specification disclosed matrix system of the present invention wherein the matrix comprises adhesive containing the active agent. The solution of loratadine was made only for comparative purposes. Applicants are referring to paragraphs 0108 and 0110 for support of the amendment, however this two paragraphs recite the softening agent and solvents used in the matrix system. The examples show that solvents used for the adhesives. In accordance to MPEP 714.02, applicant should specifically point out to where in the disclosure a support for any amendment made to the claims can be found.

The following rejection has been discussed in the previous office action, and is maintained for reasons of record:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 20-24, 29, 30, 32-38, and 40-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,910,205 ('205) combined with US 5,968,547 ('547).

The present claims 8-11, 13, 14, 16 and 47 are directed to method of treating seasonal allergy or chronic urticaria comprising administering to the patient a transdermal delivery system containing loratadine, and the claims recite broad plasma levels and release rates as implied by the term "about". Claims 20-24, 29, 30, 32-38, 45 and 48 are directed to transdermal delivery system containing loratadine and provide broad plasma levels and release rates as implied by the term "about". Claims 46 and 49 are directed to method of treating seasonal allergy or chronic urticaria comprising administering to the patient a transdermal delivery system containing loratadine wherein the device comprises reservoir layer consisting essentially of 20-90% polymer, 0.1-30% softening agent, 0.1-20% loratadine and 0.1-30% solvent, and the claims recite broad plasma levels and release rates as implied by the term "about".

US '205 teaches a transdermal delivery system of loratadine for the treatment of allergic conditions (abstract). The system is formed of patch applied to skin for a specific period of time to permit the penetration of a desired amount of loratadine through the

skin. The patch will be worn from one to four days and provides a total daily dose of 0.5 to 5 mg (col.2, lines 28-34). The patch comprises a reservoir having 10-20% loratadine; 50-60% solvent; and 20-35% fatty acid esters, i.e. softening agents (col.2, lines 19-29). The patch further comprises a backing layer and a release liner (col.2, line 64; col.3, line 6). The patch delivers 0.66 mg/15 cm²/day of loratadine for the formulation comprising loratadine, solvent and skin softener (Table I). The reference disclosed that the dose may be varied depending on the size and age of the patient, and may also depend upon the severity of the condition being treated (col.3, lines 56-60). The frequency of dosage application can be once every 3 days to once every 7 days (col.4, lines 5-10). The claimed delivery rates are met by the reference because the claimed rates are broadened by the term “about” and inclusive of the rates disclosed by the prior art. The prior art rate of delivery is 0.66 mg/15 cm²/day, i.e. 44 µg/cm²/day, and as claimed is about 16.2 µg/cm²/day.

Additionally, the claimed release rates are determined by Valia-Chein cell, and the prior art is silent regarding the test method and the art does not appear to rely on, or teach the test method. The Patent Office is not equipped with test facilities for result testing. Hence, the instantly claimed release rates are met by the prior art.

The reference does not teach the specific delivery profile of loratadine, the specific amounts of different ingredients, or specific structure and formulation of a transdermal device including specific polymer, specific solvents and specific softening agents in the transdermal delivery system.

US '547 teaches a transdermal drug delivery device for controlled delivery of drug for 3 days and maintaining the delivery for additional 2 days in accordance to the zero order kinetic of the drug (abstract). When the drug applied transdermally, it follows the pharmacokinetics to provide its effect over prolonged period (col.4, lines 42-67, col. 5, lines 1-8). The device comprises backing layer, polymeric reservoir and protective liner (col.20, lines 17-27). The reservoir comprising: 1-90% of polymeric material, 0.1-30% of the drug, 0.1-30% softener, and 0.1-30% of solvent (col.20, lines 55-60). The polymeric material of the reservoir is pressure sensitive adhesive and contains rubber, silicone or block-copolymers (col.18, lines 55-65). The solvents used include those contain at least one acidic group, particularly, monoesters of dicarboxylic acids, such as monomethyl glutarate and monomethyl adipate (col.20, lines 5-10). The softeners include medium chain triglycerides of the caprylic/capric acids or coconut oil, undecanol, octanol, and dodecanol (col.19, lines 58-68). The backing is laminate of polymer and aluminum foil (col.18, lines 25-30).

It is evident from the disclosure of US '547 that when the drug is included in the described transdermal device, the drug follows and is delivered according to its pharmacokinetics for period of 5 days as desired by applicants. The structure and formulation of the reservoir of the present transdermal device are identical to that of US '547. Applicants disclosed on the paragraph bridging page 23 and 24 that the pharmacokinetic information for oral loratadine is available in the literature and a release rate for a loratadine transdermal delivery system was calculated from the available data. Applicants also admit on page 24, first full paragraph that any type of

transdermal delivery system may be used in accordance with the methods of the present invention so long as the desired pharmacokinetic are attained over at least 3 days to about 8 days.

Therefore, having available within hands the disclosure of US '205 that teaches loratadine delivered transdermally from formulation comprising solvent and softener, and US '547 that teaches drug delivery rate over 3-5 days following the pharmacokinetics of the drug and is attained by specific structure and formulation of a transdermal drug delivery system, along with the known pharmacokinetics of loratadine, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have designed transdermal drug delivery device to deliver loratadine as disclosed by US '205 and use the device disclosed by US '547 and would calculate the transdermal release rates from the available pharmacokinetic data of loratadine to achieve a transdermal delivery device having the structure and reservoir formulation comprising loratadine, polymer, softener selected from medium chain triglycerides of the caprylic/capric acids or coconut oil, undecanol, octanol, and dodecanol, and solvent selected from one of monoesters of dicarboxylic acids, wherein the device delivers loratadine at a delivery rate in accordance to its pharmacokinetics to treat patients suffering from allergic reactions with great success.

The determination of the relative release rate via an in-vitro permeation test utilizing a Valia-Chien cell is known in the art and it is not part of the claimed method of treating allergic rhinitis; or even a part of the transdermal device that provide particular plasma levels of loratadine. It is only an in-vitro diagnostic test that is expected to

provide the same results obtained from two similar delivery devices tested under the same circumstances, and the recitation of this in-vitro test does not impart patentability to claims directed to method of treating allergic rhinitis or claims directed to transdermal device applied to patients to provide specific plasma levels of loratadine, i.e. in vivo use.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 07/31/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse this rejection by arguing that:

Applicants argue that the Reder patent does not teach or suggest a transdermal delivery system containing loratadine, and is directed to methods of providing sustained analgesia with buprenorphine or opioid, i.e. the Reder patent not limited to buprenorphine, but also extends to other opioids. The physical, chemical and pharmacological properties of the active agents of the Reder patent are different from the physical, chemical and pharmacological properties of loratadine and the teaching of the Reder patent (i.e., relative mean release rates) do not extend to loratadine and its claimed release profile.

In response to this argument, it is established that in considering the disclosure of the reference, it is proper to take into account not only the specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom. *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968). The rational to modify or to combine the prior art does not have to be expressly stated in the prior art; the rational may be expressly or impliedly contained in the prior art or it may be reasoned from knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often

suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination or modification to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972). Kogan teaches loratadine administered transdermally and it is evident from the disclosure of Reder that when the drug is included in the described transdermal device, the drug follows and is delivered according to its pharmacokinetics for period of 5 days as desired by applicants. The structure and formulation of the reservoir of the present transdermal device are identical to that of Reder. Applicants disclosed on the paragraph bridging page 23 and 24 that the pharmacokinetic information for oral loratadine is available in the literature and a release rate for a loratadine transdermal delivery system was calculated from the available data. Applicants also admit on page 24, first full paragraph that any type of transdermal delivery system may be used in accordance with the methods of the present invention so long as the desired pharmacokinetic are attained over at least 3 days to about 8 days. At the time of the invention, one having ordinary skill in the art looking for a structure for transdermal patch for sustained release of drug and knowing the properties of the drug intended to be delivered, would have looked at Reder's patent or any other patent delivering drug transdermally. It has been held that "When a patent simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform and yields no more than one would expect from such an arrangement, the combination is obvious." *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740 (2007) (quoting *Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc.*, 425 U.S. 273,282 (1976)). "When

the question is whether a patent claiming the combination of elements of prior art is obvious,” the relevant question is “whether the improvement is more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions.”

Applicants argue that the Kogan patent lacks a suggestion of the specific claimed release profile of loratadine. In order for someone to alter the loratadine formulation of the Kogan patent, someone would have to decide that loratadine release rate of the Kogan patent is problematic; and that loratadine can be administered in a transdermal delivery system that maintains a therapeutic blood level of loratadine until the end of at least the five-day dosing interval as recited in the present claims. Then, that person would have to decide on how to determine the amounts that will be included in the transdermal delivery system and a particular manner of accomplishing this task. There is no information provided in the cited references that suggests that a transdermal delivery system that maintains a therapeutic blood level of loratadine as recited in the present claims would be efficacious or beneficial.

In response to this argument, and upon careful review to Kogan reference, it is noticed that flux rate ranges from 6 $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{day}$ to 58 $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{day}$ that the release rate disclosed by Kogan obviates the claimed delivery rates because the delivery rate disclosed by Kogan is 44 $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{day}$ and the claimed delivery rate has lower range from 2 to 16.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}$ which is equivalent to 48 to 389 $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{day}$. Therefore, the claimed delivery rates are met by the reference because the claimed rates overlapped with the rates disclosed by the reference. Further, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Loratadine was known at the time of the invention to be administered transdermally as disclosed by Kogan. Reder taught that when the drug is included in the described transdermal device, the drug follows and is delivered according to its pharmacokinetics for period of 5 days as desired by applicants. Applicants disclosed on the paragraph bridging page 23 and 24 that the pharmacokinetic information for oral loratadine is available in the literature and a release rate for a loratadine transdermal delivery system was calculated from the available data. Applicants also admit on page 24, first full paragraph that any type of transdermal delivery system may be used in accordance with the methods of the present invention so long as the desired pharmacokinetic are attained over at least 3 days to about 8 days. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have designed transdermal drug delivery device to deliver loratadine as disclosed by Kogan and use the device disclosed by Reder and would calculate the transdermal release rates from the available pharmacokinetic data of loratadine to achieve a transdermal delivery device having the structure and reservoir formulation comprising polymer, softener, solvent and loratadine that delivers loratadine at a delivery rate in accordance to its pharmacokinetics to treat patients suffering from allergic reactions with great success. It has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, the cited prior art in the field of applicant's endeavor since both Kogan and Reder are concerned about transdermal delivery of active agents over 3-5 days following the pharmacokinetics of the drug that is attained by specific structure and formulation of a transdermal drug delivery system, and their combination is reasonable as stated above. The invention as a whole is taught by the combination of the references; therefore, *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established in the meaning of USC 103 (a).

Applicants argue that the present specification is not part of the prior art and it is impermissible for the Examiner to rely on the knowledge learned from the present specification to support an obviousness rejection. None of the exemplary rationals for supporting a conclusion of obviousness provide for the use of the specification as a "road map" to obviousness. See MPEP, section 2143.

In response to this argument, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Applicants argue that Kogan and Reder do not teach loratadine solution. The Kogan patent teaches measuring flux rates with a Franz diffusion cell. Column 3, lines 28-30. It is submitted that the Franz diffusion cell test is not suitable for evaluation of solution or suspension-formulations.

In response to this argument, applicants' attention is directed to the teaching of Kogan that is: patch comprises a reservoir having 10-20% loratadine, 50-60% solvent, and 20-35% fatty acid esters, i.e. softening agents. Therefore, in presence of solvent for loratadine, it is expected to have loratadine solution in the patch. The method for measuring the transdermal flux rate of the drug does not impart patentability to the claims. The Patent Office does not have the facilities for preparing the claimed materials and comparing them with the prior art inventions. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977); and *In re Fitzgerald et al.*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isis A. Ghali whose telephone number is (571) 272-0595. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila Landau can be reached on (571) 272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

IG

/Isis A Ghali/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1611